DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 046 EC 302 671

AUTHOR Kustaa, Friedrich Freddy
TITLE Special Education in Developing Countries: The Dilemma of Public Policy Making in the Context of Cultural Exchanges and Diffusion of Innovations.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Comparative Education; *Delivery Systems; *Developing Nations; *Disabilities; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Models; Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Special Education

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the issue of whether and to what degree developing countries should copy the models of special education delivery used in developed countries and identifies potential problems with this approach. The paper reviews the literature noting three general outlooks: the first sees special education systems of the United States and other developed countries as perfect models for developing countries; the second outlook argues that the developing countries should not adopt or duplicate the special education programs of developed countries for obvious financial reasons; and the third outlook emphasizes that all countries, developed and developing, have something to learn form one another. The paper then encourages a critical appraisal of the usage by developing countries of special education concepts (such as "transition" and "integration") from developed countries. It presents 14 recommendations for developing countries, which include extension of educational rights to the handicapped, increased emphasis on prevention of disabilities, improvement of teacher education programs, encouragement of parental involvement, development of appropriate school curriculums, improvement in data collection, and decreased class sizes. (Contains 13 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 365 046

SPECIAL EDUCATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: THE DILEMMA OF PUBLIC POLICY MAKING IN THE CONTEXT OF CULTURAL EXCHANGES AND DIFFUSION OF INNOVATIONS

By

Friedrich Freddy Kustaa

Innovative Programs in Education
College of Education
The University of New Mexico
941 Buena Vista Dr. S.E. G206
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Friedrich Kustaa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Publication Date: Spring 1990

EC 302671

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In many developing countries such as Namibia and South Africa, the delivery of special educational services is, by and large, poorly developed or in many cases non-existent. In special education, as in many other areas of co-operation between nations, developing countries have tended to copy what has been done in developed countries. This approach has partly to do with the fact that in developing countries, more often than not, special education delivery systems of the United States and other developed countries have been viewed as ideal models because of: 1) the number of children being served; 2) the quantity of resources allocated to special education; 3) the location and number of special education schools/programs; and 4) the quality of services provided.[1] Not surprisingly, in recent years this indiscriminate copying of special education programs has produced a major policy issue in the management of special education delivery systems in developing countries. This policy issue in the developing countries pertaining to the copying of what has been done in the U.S. and other developed countries may often produce what Henri Bissonnier calls a "...dangerous carricature" which creates more problems as these countries seek to formulate the needed appropriate policies for quality special education programs suited to their own particular circumstances.[2]

It is important to stress early on that this public policy issue in question has not been extensively researched and in general it is difficult to find books and articles which have a direct bearing on the topic. However, the present author made a concerted effort in utilizing a computer data search in order to locate articles and books on special education from around the world which touch on the topic. Most of the useful works which turned out on the computer data search are papers presented by educators from various developed and developing countries at international conferences on special education.

The main objective of the paper is to discuss all the views presented by the authors, both pro and con, and then argue that indeed there is a danger in the mere copying by the developing countries of what has been done in the U.S. and other developed countries in the field of special education. In borrowing from some of the authors and based on my own personal experience and perceptions, I shall argue that indeed developing countries need to have a strong confidence in their own initiatives in the process of formulating their public policies vis-a-vis the management of special education programs. Secondly, I shall suggest that it seems more meaningful for developing countries to carefully scrutinize the meaning and usefulness of developed countries' educational practices and terms such as "mainstreaming," "transition" and "integration" before they try to adapt them to their particular cultural circumstances. Finally, I shall argue that this public policy issue pertaining to cultural exchanges between developed and developing countries in the field of education in general and special education in particular is a complex one, and no easy answers can be provided at this stage. Nevertheless, I shall stress that as educators we will come closer to the understanding of this public policy issue if we view educational systems as dynamic but complex organizations.

The literature on which this paper is based falls into three categories. The first group of papers fall into the category which sees the special education delivery systems of the U.S. and other developed countries as perfect models and essentially calls upon the developing countries to adopt and duplicate these models in their own educational systems. Some of the papers in this category do not explicitly call upon developing countries to copy the special education programs of developed countries per se, but discuss the problems or concepts in special education programs of developing countries using terms or concepts such as "mainstreaming" commonly used in developed countries such as the U.S. without specifying the meaning of those terms within

the specific cultural context of developing countries. The second category of papers discusses various aspects of special education in developing countries but argues that the developing countries should not adopt or duplicate successful special education training programs of developed countries for obvious financial reasons. The third category of papers challenges both the view of the first and second categories of papers and argues that both views are incorrect in pointing out that developing countries should either simply adopt and duplicate special education programs of developed countries or simply reject any insights or educational innovations from developed countries. According to this view, all countries, developed and developing, have something to learn from one another.

The first category of papers includes the works of two South African educators, Freda Muller and Edna Freinkel, and one paper by a Nigerian educator, Dr. P.O. Mba. The works of the three educators are essentially papers which they presented at the First World Congress on Future Special Education.[3] Both Freinkel and Muller discuss what they see as the current trends in special education in South Africa. Freinkel is a co-principal at a segregated school for white learning disabled students called Rebecca Ostrowiak School of Reading which was founded by her mother. Freinkel's paper is entitled "Latest Trends on Special Education in the Republic of South Africa."[4] According to Freinkel, indications are that special education in the Republic of South Africa is now receiving excellent attention throughout the broadest spectrum of the population of all colors. Further, Freinkel believes that the future is bright because the subject is under constant scrutiny, particularly by the majority of universities and education departments. Despite her optimism for the future of special education in South Africa, Freinkel points out that there is a difference of opinion in that country as to what constitutes special education. Freinkel notes that the South African

Department of National Education "clarifies special education as implying only those who are physically handicapped, i.e. blind, deaf, crippled*, cerebral palsied or epileptic" and provides segregated facilities for such categories. This approach, according to Freinkel, contrasts with that of the Provincial education departments which consider special education to imply those physically normal children whose mental retardation results in IQs of 50 - 85 qualifying them for special classes in primary school, or special high schools from age 13. Freinkel concludes that the field of specific learning disabilities is the newest challenge to be met in South African education.

Freinkel's paper, among those in category one, does not explicitly call for countries such as South Africa to duplicate the educational programs of developed countries, but discusses special education in South Africa without emphasizing the cultural specificity of that country. Thus, one is left with the impression that special education in South Africa may mean the same thing in the U.S. or other countries. For example, Freinkel attempts to present the impression that she is discussing latest trends in special education in the whole of South Africa when she is actually only dealing with special education trends as they pertain to the white handicapped students.

Muller, like Freinkel, is a principal at a segregated school for white learning disabled children called Norwood Remedial School. Her paper, entitled "A Remedial School in a Changing World" deals with Norwood Remedial School.[5] According to Muller, Norwood admits children with both learning and emotional problems whether these are primary or secondary students. Further, Muller states that at Norwood "we are in line with the current thinking in the United States proposed rule making in that we do not admit children who are mentally retarded,sensorially impaired, physically handicapped

---

* Despite its derogative connotation, the term "crippled" is still used by several South African authors and education departments.

or psychotic." Muller briefly discusses the issue of "mainstreaming" and acknowledges that a controversy about "mainstreaming" is raging in South Africa. Unfortunately, Muller does not discuss what this controversy about "mainstreaming" in South Africa entails. Nevertheless, it is evident that Muller sees the special education programs of the U.S. and other developed countries as essentially perfect models. For example, Muller states that, "we have learned much from special educators both in the United Kingdom and the United States of America." Muller then proceeds to stress that "our own philosophy is broadly in line with the current evaluation and prescriptive teaching methods evolved by [Dorris] Johnson and [Helmer] Mykelbust at Northwestern University, whilst at the same time we adopt an essentially eclectic and pragmatic approach. ('If it works, use it')."

The third paper in category one is that by Dr. P.O. Mba entitled "Issues of Social Adjustment and Societal Attitudes: A Comparative Perspective."[6] This paper is worth discussing at length because of its outstanding treatment of the negative attitudes and beliefs about the handicapped in developing countries which may have a direct influence on special education public policy making. Dr. Mba is explicitly urging the Nigerian Federal Government to follow in the footsteps of the United States in the formulation of wise national, state and local laws that will create positive attitudes towards the handicapped. According to Dr. Mba, beginning with the legal mandates dating "from 1863 the US eliminated countless barriers, and guaranteed to the handicapped human rights that make that country a unique model as far as the provision of services for the handicapped is concerned." It is, however, essential to point out that the paper of Dr. Mba makes a major contribution to the literature in special education in that it deals with the attitudes towards the handicapped in the cultural contexts of nineteen developing nations despite the fact that he pays little attention to the discussion

of the complexity of legal mandates.

The study of Dr. Mba is based on an investigation involving countries such as Kenya, Thailand, Malaysia, Swaziland, Ethiopia, Ghana, Iran, etc. Dr. Mba's study confirms the belief that attitudes of the general public toward the handicapped, or disabilities in general, are similar in nature in all countries cited above. Dr. Mba finds that in the main, negative attitudes toward the disabled in developing countries are rooted in superstitions and peoples' natural tendency to ascribe to supernatural beings that which they cannot explain rationally. According to Mba, in developing countries beliefs about causes of disabilities, or particular afflictions tend to condition attitudes and reactions not only toward the disabled person but toward his entire family or clan. Mba cites the examples of many developing countries including Nigeria and Ghana where handicapping conditions such as deafness, blindness, mental retardation, orthopedic impairments, etc. are attributed to punishment by vengeful gods for wrongs done in the present or past incarnations, including infidelity of parents, wanton murder, violation of time-honored traditions, eating prohibited foods, fishing in sacred waters, refusal to appease ancestral gods with sacrifices, and heedlessness on the part of expectant mothers who expose certain parts of the body,or walk in the dark at odd hours.

Furthermore, Dr. Mba says that in a number of developing countries "there is a strong belief in witchcraft, evil spirits and demons who parade the streets at night causing havoc in the form of disabilities to those who ignore their warnings, appropriate property not belonging to them, or refuse love overtures of mermaids." Dr. Mba indicates that in northern Kenya, for example, around Lake Victoria,"The belief is strong that a congenitally deaf child is concealing some secrets from his family: as he would not divulge some bad news confided to him by a god, he opts to be 'deaf and dumb'." Mba adds that among some "tribes" in Nigeria some forms of

deafness are attributed to similar beliefs: "If a man had been to(sic) subservient, servile and imprudently obedient, and as a result met his death he chooses in his next incarnation to be 'deaf and dumb' to avoid being 'every man's Jack'." According to Dr. Mba, other causes of disability according to beliefs in developing countries include: ridiculing disabled persons, failure to fulfill marriage commitments(defaulting in the payment of dowry or bride-price), inscrupulous acquisition of wealth(Kenya, Nigeria, Swaziland, etc.), a pregnant woman watching a silent movie(or show), or eating the core of a pineapple(Malaysia), heredity, vengeance of gods on couples for frequent bickerings, especially at night, and a hasty remarriage on the part of a widow, etc.

Dr. Mba reminds us that certain beliefs about the disabled are after all not restricted to the developing countries but are also to be found in developed countries as well. Dr. Mba notes that "in civilized countries like the United States and some nations of Europe, the superstitious beliefs about the disabled and so on which hold many a developing country in thraldom are referred to as myths and folklores, implying that beliefs in them no longer hold sway." Even so, Dr. Mba points out that Beatrice A. Wright tells us that"the 'myths' about disability is still part of the American folklore which strongly influences people in their attitudes toward the disabled, because they seem so necessarily true and compelling that both laymen and experts succumb to their power and either ignore facts that belie them or distort facts to fit them."[7] Dr. Mba concludes by emphasizing that much research needs to be conducted in developing countries, especially on the attitudes toward the handicapped as a group and towards specific categories of the disabled, and on the direct negative impact these attitudes have on special education public policy making. This task, according to Dr. Mba, is worthwhile to carry out because already evidence abounds to support the fact that prejudice against the disabled is almost universal,

and affects their social, economic, educational, mental and psychological well being.

The second category of papers are represented by the works of Cieloha C. Danford and Shirley J. Joseph. Danford's paper entitled "Special Education in the Context of National Development: The Case of Mexico" was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco in 1986.[8] Joseph's paper, called "Special Education in Economically Deprived Areas," was presented at the First World Congress on Future Special Education.[9] Joseph's paper is based on a study of special education programs in several Caribbean countries. Joseph argues that developing countries should not and need not duplicate successful special education training programs of developed countries because of lack of funds and the fact that in developing countries a large number of children are already out of school. According to Joseph, the main consideration should be given to political systems and teacher education systems of developing countries, convincing them that as opposed to developed countries they should constantly deal with the dilemma of trying to improve the quantitative aspects of their systems in the environment of scarcity. Joseph suggests that the special education programs of developed countries are ill-fitted to the circumstances of developing countries because they are more concerned with aspects of quality rather than quantity.

Danford's paper uses an historical perspective to create a context for comparison and understanding of the path of special education in the less economically developed country of Mexico. Danford draws upon primary sources and describes the evolutionary path of special education in Mexico and offers a rationale for the existence of any special education services within an environment of scarcity. Essentially, Danford utilizes what she calls "a commonality-based analysis" of special education development which identifies weaknesses

and strengths common to both the United States and Mexico. For example, Danford points out that with the passage of Public Law 94-142 in 1975 the U.S. has embarked on massive reforms and innovations in the field of special education. At the same time, Danford does not fail to remind us that legal mandates such as P.L.94-142 are associated with various complex issues and lack of political will to fully implement existing universal special education legislation. Likewise, Danford identifies one of the strengths of the Mexican education system, namely its long tradition of a commitment to public education. But due to the present scarcity of funds, especially in the context of the alarmingly huge foreign debt, Danford does not see how it is possible for Mexico to duplicate or copy the U.S. special education programs, especially with regard to funding levels.

The third category of papers are represented by the work of Bissonnier, mentioned earlier, and a report based on an UNESCO Expert Meeting on Special Education.[10] Bissonnier is by far the author who explicitly challenges the views of both the first and second categories of papers. According to Bissonnier, for too long in matters of cultural exchange between the developing and developed countries, the relationship has been like a one way street: "Everything should come from the developed countries and go to the developing ones. So the last ones were seen as having only to receive, the first ones as having only to give. Richness and science and competence as well as power were considered as the privilege of the same side." Then Bissonnier says that a second step led to the opposite reaction: "Then we have often heard that developing countries have nothing to receive from developed ones. Problems were supposed to be so different that experiences were absolutely not transferable." In Bissonnier's view, several arguments have been presented to the effect that the developed nations should let the developing ones try to do their own experiments and research and not interfere in them. According to Bissonnier, the motto then has become: "If you like,

give some money, but no advices, no counseling, no programs. The developing countries are perfectly able to find by themselves what is best and appropriate for them..."

Furthermore, Bissonnier observes that just now we have reached a third step where it is becoming clear that both preceding attitudes are equally wrong and that at the same time both contain a certain truth. In Bissonnier's view, what is true in all matters of co-operation between nations is true in the field of special education, namely: "every country developed or developing, has something to give and something to receive." In this connection Bissonnier explains that experience shows that it is not right to say that developing countries have nothing to receive - except perhaps money - from the hands of developed ones. Bissonnier points out that "we have seen a waste of wealth and energy in developing countries due to lack of experience." Bissonnier cites the example where "giant and inconvenient buildings which had cost a deal and would have been realized with more modest means and more opportunity for doing good educational work, if the people in charge of their realization would have taken some advices(sic) from those developed nations which have known this kind of institutions." Nevertheless, Bissonnier agrees with others that a mere copy of what has been done in developed countries' special education programs may produce what he calls "a ridiculous and even a dangerous carricature." For instance, Bissonnier takes up the issue of "behavior modification" to obtain a "normalization of the exceptional" which he says was met with so much enthusiasm in some developed countries to the extent that the developing countries were urged to adopt such methods. According to Bissonnier, shortly after several developing countries started to adopt such methods, the very methods were being abandoned by those in the developed countries who a few years ago were fond of them. Bissonnier concludes by emphasizing that the developed countries have also something to learn from the developing ones in many

areas and specifically in the field of education. In his conclusion Bissonnier cites the contribution of Africa, Latin America and Asia in the field of education. These include: the concept of basic education in Africa - the idea that education entails more than a teacher and the classroom, and that education can take place outside of the classroom, involving the family, the tribe and the village; the concept in Latin America of early stimulation of the disabled children with the co-operation of mothers and volunteers and; in Asia the variety in the tasks offered in pre-vocational institutions or sheltered workshops which contrasts sharply with several methods in developed countries where the handicapped are often transferred into robots.

The UNESCO paper notes that at the UNESCO meeting in Paris on the provision of special education in developed and developing countries considerable attention was paid to the problems of the latter countries. UNESCO notes that the provision of special education in developing countries could not be the same as in the developed countries because of specific economic and social conditions which make the provision of special education very difficult. According to UNESCO, in developing nations the principal of a broad based provision of special education services may be accepted, but not yet put into practice for economic and administrative reasons. Further, UNESCO stresses that developing countries need to have confidence in their own initiatives and not feel their efforts must necessarily follow the patterns set by highly developed countries, nor that there is little they can do without outside help and expertise. In UNESCO's view, failure of developing countries to keep this in mind results in a loss of creativity and dynamism which can only make problems worse. UNESCO, then, emphasizes that developing countries should be encouraged to take an interest in their own welfare, find their own solutions and make their own decisions.

UNESCO concludes by suggesting that a reasonable alternative for developing countries would be to adapt rather than copy the special education programs of developed countries.

At this point the question to ponder is what can we discern from all the views expressed above which will have a direct bearing on special education policy making in the developing countries? In the attempt to answer this question I shall rely on my own personal experience and perceptions as well as the research literature.

To begin with, it is fair to say that all the papers discussed above, in one way or another, help to dramatize the dilemma of special education public policy making in developing countries. In my own view, the papers in category one do indeed raise several questions in that both Freinkel and Muller discuss special education public policy issues in South Africa in a rather confusing manner. First of all, Muller seems to assume that what works in the U.S. and the United Kingdom in special education will work in South Africa. Secondly, Muller says that South Africa is, in general, in line with several U.S. special education rules. This statement is very much misleading to the readers who are not aware of the fact that, unlike the U.S., as far as the law is concerned, South Africa is a country which remains committed to the provision of education to its citizens on a segregated basis, as well as the segregation of the handicapped children from the general society with an emphasis on regional centers for disabled individuals.[11] It is for this reason that it seems fair to argue that the use of the term "integration", especially in the context of South Africa will continue to reflect good intentions on the part of some educators rather than the commitment of the general public and the country to integrate the handicapped in the educational system and the society at large.

Moreover, both Freinkel and Muller do not specify the cultural specificity of South Africa in their discussion of

"mainstreaming." For example, in the U.S. the term "mainstreaming" refers to the concept of the "least restrictive environment" as mandated by P.L.94-142 which specifies that "to the maximum extent possible, all disabled children be educated with children who are not disabled" and that "special classes, separate schooling or other removal of disabled children from regular educational environment could only be considered if the disability was so severe that supplemental aids and services still could not allow the student to benefit sufficiently from regular classroom."[12] With this in mind one can reasonably say that even if South Africa embarks on the implementation of U.S. "mainstreaming" procedures the term "mainstreaming" cannot have the same meaning in South Africa because of peculiar defects and the cultural background of that country's educational system such as: the large percentage of inadequately qualified teachers who are not trained to individualize instruction and; the very nature of bigger class sizes of one teacher to forty eight students, especially in black schools. In fact, research indicates that in several South African schools such as in Soweto near Johannesburg and in the rural areas it is common to find teacher/student ratios reaching 1:60 and 1:100.[13]

Further, the same dilemma applies to the term "transition" which South African educators use in the discussion of special education issues in their country. In the U.S. the term "transition", as Richard Weatherman puts it, "is used...to mean a general set of processes that assist a handicapped individual at or near the completion of approximately 15 or more years of special education to move to independent or semi-independent employment and living."[14] But when the term "transition" is used in reference to South Africa, one needs to be cautious and try to ascertain what is meant by "transition" in a country with a high unemployment rate for youth, high dropout rates and a high secondary school graduation failure rate well over 50%.[15]

The discussion above pertaining to a critical appraisal of the usage by developing countries of special education concepts developed in the U.S. and other developed countries is not meant to suggest that developing countries have nothing to learn from developed ones. Indeed Bissonnier seems convincing when he argues that all countries, developed or developing, have something to give and something to receive. However, the discussion of the terms such as "mainstreaming," "transition" and "integration" is meant to indicate the need not only for scrutinizing their meaning in the cultural context of developing countries but also in the cultural context of developed countries themselves. In doing so, we then become aware that special education programs of developed countries are not perfect and that, for example, "mainstreaming" practices in the U.S. still go hand in hand with various controversies such as who should pay for related services. As a matter of fact, a number of cases associated with these controversies have been litigated.[16]

In fact, one can argue further that the U.S. is also not completely successful in the implementation of several aspects mandated by P.L.94-142 as it pertains to the funding of special education; and the "transition" and "integration" of the handicapped. Danford shows that since the passage of P.L.94-142, Congress has never voted more than 40% of its full funding.[17] She further states that increasingly, the burden for special education funding that Congress has mandated has fallen on the states and local districts who themselves also will not, or in some cases cannot, fully fund P.L.94-142. Therefore, Danford says that "even though Public Law 94-142 has brought about massive reform in US special education, the country is still left with more strong rhetoric and the appearance of good intentions rather than a fully funded and implemented, universal system of special education." Thus, Danford reiterates that "what appeared in 1975 with the pas-

sage of Public Law 94-142 to be political will may have been in reality, much more closely related to political expediency."

With regard to "transition" and "integration," once again one can argue that the U.S. has not been successful in the "integration" and provision of employment opportunities for handicapped individuals. For example, in many centers of the nation, the U.S. has begun to provide community services for handicapped individuals and to move away from the practice of providing services to the handicapped in regional centers, but much remains to be done to "integrate" the handicapped in the mainstream of society.[18] Needless to say, as these regional centers are being closed down there is the emerging problem in the U.S. where the handicapped are often forced to return to unprepared communities without attempts being made to provide for a smooth "transition."[19] With regard to employment opportunities for the disabled, A New Way of Thinking states that two thirds of all Americans with disabilities between the ages of 16 and 64 are not working.[20]

Consideration of the ongoing dilemmas and controversies inherent in the special education programs of countries such as the U.S. and other countries in general, brings us to the discussion of educational systems as dynamic but complex organizations. This discussion helps to clarify why cultural exchanges between educational systems present problems. First and foremost, I should state that the arguments of both Bissonnier and UNESCO seem reasonable. In other words, I agree that cultural exchange in all fields of endeavor between developing and developed countries should be a two way street and that developing countries must adapt rather than copy successful special education programs of developed countries. However, I should point out that both Bissonnier and UNESCO fail to clarify what it entails for developing countries to adapt rather than to copy or duplicate developed countries' special education programs. In my view, this is the question which is at the very heart of special education public policy

issues with regard to cultural exchanges between the developing and developed countries. My argument here is that the suggestion of "adaptive education" does not deal with the issue of unintended effects of educational reforms and innovations whether or not they are produced abroad or locally.[21]

To conclude,I submit that the information discussed above can be used to promote special educaiton program management and assist administrators in developing countries in the determination and promotion of quality special education programs. For example, adminstrators in developing countries can come to grasp the concept of "adaptive education" through continuing research within the framework of viewing educational systems as dynamic but complex organizations. In this regard, Philip Coombs has provided several insights about educational change which can be very useful if administrators can keep them in mind in the process of educational public policy making.[22] Among other things, Coombs observes that: 1) education the world over is among the most complex of all human endeavors and, hence, it is no surprise that education lacks scientific methods to analyze its own affairs and scientific research to improve its practices, efficiency and output; 2) education lacks developed strategies for the management of educational change and, thus, often educational reforms and innovations are associated with unintentional effects and outcomes; and 3) educational systems seem stubbornly resistant to reforms and innovations in their own affairs and therefore legal mandates, educational reforms and innovations may be resisted even within the educational systems themselves.

Finally, in the process of continuing research to improve the quality of special education delivery systems, administrators in developing countries should, at the minimum, take the following recommendations into consideration:

1) There should be policies which recognize the rights of disabled persons to an education. In other words, com-

pulsory education must be extended to the handicapped and; there should be guidelines which include the special needs of the handicapped into the educational structures.

2) The public must be educated in the preventions of avoidable handicaps, such as polio, and in general attitudes towards those with disablities.
3) Health personnel should be trained to provide disability prevention and detection services as well as nutrition programs.
4) Health care should be provided for pregnant women; newborns and working parents; better and appropriate services should be provided for orphans and abandoned children.
5) The high cost of special education can be reduced by employing cost-effective measures such as: immunization programs to prevent diseases such as polio; the reduction of wasteage in education by eliminating inefficient practices such as grade retention and; the reduction of high dropout rates through examinations by developing better teaching techniques and the use of automatic grade promotion if a large number of students continue to fail examinations.
6) Regular teacher training programs should be broadened to better serve students with special education needs and to facilitate their integration into regular schools.
7) The teaching of inadequately trained teachers can be upgraded by the provision of constant teacher in-service training programs.
8) Parental involvement in special education programs must be consistently encouraged.
9) Special education administrators and managers should seek co-operation of other government departments, the private sector,etc. to find better ways for the creation

of job opportunities for the handicapped.

10) Relevant school curriculums should be developed which enable handicapped students to develop life and problem solving skills so that they can have independent, productive and satisfying life styles.
11) The development of improved methods of information gathering and statistics reporting can alleviate the problems of estimating the number of handicapped children.
12) The quality and the level of funding should be uniform and equal for special education programs in urban and rural areas.
13) There should be concerted efforts to decrease the large class sizes which make it difficult for even well qualified teachers to individualize instruction.
14) Last and not least, the quality of special education programs can be assured by developing constant program planning and evaluation procedures.

Footnotes

[1]Cieloha C. Danford, "Special Education in the Context of National Development: The Case of Mexico." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association(67th, San Francisco, CA April 16-20, 1986)p.1. (Microfiche ED 271 916).

[2]Henri Bissonnier, "What Have We to Give, What Have We to Receive, What We Deal with the Developing Nations." Paper presented at the World Congress on Future Special Education(First, Stirling, Scotland, June 25 - July 1, 1978) p.2. (Microfiche ED 157 273).

[3]All these papers were presented at the World Congress of Future Special Education(First, Stirling, Scotland, June 25 - July 1, 1978).

[4]Edna Freinkel, (World Congress on Future Special Education)Ibid. (Microfiche ED 158 553).

[5]Freda Muller, (World Congress on Future Special Education)Ibid. (Microfiche ED 157 350).

[6]Dr. P.O.Mba, (World Congress on Future Special Education)Ibid. (Microfiche ED 158 539).

[7]Ibid., p.1.

[8]Danford, op. cit.

[9]Shirley J. Joseph's paper presented at the World Congress on Future Special Education, op. cit. (Microfiche ED 157 326).

[10]"United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization(UNESCO) Expert Meeting on Special Education." Report presented at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, October 15-20, 1979)Final Report. (Microfiche ED 228 758).

[11]For a discussion of special education in South Africa with an emphasis on regional centers for the handicapped, see Marg Csapo, "Separate Development: Education and Special Education in South Africa," International Journal of Special Education No.1. Vol.1, 1986.

[12]Danford, op. cit., p.9.

[13]Csapo, op. cit., p.62.

[14]Richard Weatherman, "Impressions from Latin America," Minnesota Severely Handicapped Delivery Systems Project, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education, University of Minnesota, April 7, 1987, p.11.

[15]David R. Smock, "Black Education in South Africa: The Current Situation,"IIE Research Report Number Two, South African Education Program Institute of International Education, January, 1983, pp.1,7.

[16]The case of (Armstrong v. Kline, 1980) is cited in

Charles A. Maher and Randy Elliot Bennett, Planning and Evaluating Special Education Services(Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1984)p.2.

[17]Danford, op. cit., p.9.

[18]David Braddock et al, "Financing Community Services in the United States: Results of a Nationwide Study," Mental Retardation February(1987)pp.21-30.

[19]Weatherman, op. cit., p.10.

[20]A New Way of Thinking, Report presented by State of Minnesota, State Planning Agency, The Governor's Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities, January(1987)p.32.

[21]Also see a discussion of related programs' side effects in Maher and Bennet, op. cit., p.15.

[22]Philip H. Coombs, The World Educational Crisis: A Systems Analysis(New York, London: Oxford University Press, 1968)p.2; The World Crisis in Education: The View from the Eightees(New York, Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press, 1985)p.67.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A New Way of Thinking. Report presented by the State of Minnesota, State Planning Agency, The Governor's Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities, January 1987.

Bissonnier, Henri. "What Have We to Give, What Have We to Receive, What We Deal with the Developing Nations." Paper presented at the World Congress on Future Special Education(First, Stirling, Scotland, June 25 - July 1, 1978) (Microfiche ED 157 273).

Braddock, David et al. "Financing Community Services in the United States: Results of a Nationwide Study." Mental Retardation, February, 1987, pp.21-30.

Csapo, Marg. "Separate Development: Education and Special Education in South Africa." International Journal of Special Education. 1986, Vol.1, No.1.

Coombs, Philip H. The World Educational Crisis: A Systems Analysis. New York, London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

_____. The World Crisis in Education: The View from the Eightees. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Danford, Cieloha C. "Special Education in the Context of National Development: The Case of Mexico." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association(67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986, pp.1-46. (Microfiche ED 271 916).

Freinkel, Edna. "Latest Trends on Special Education in the Republic of South Africa." Paper presented at World Congress on Future Special Education(First, Stirling, Scotland, June 25 - July 1, 1978) (Microfiche ED 158 553).

Joseph, Shirley J. "Special Education in Economically Deprived Areas." Paper presented at the World Congress on Future Special Education(First, Stirling, Scotland, June 25 - July 1, 1978)pp.1-12. (Microfiche ED 157 326).

Maher, Charles A. and Bennett, Randy Elliot. Planning and Evaluating Special Education Services." Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1984.

Mba, P.O. "Issues of Social Adjustment and Societal Attitudes: A Comparative Perspective." Paper presented at the World Congress on Future Special Education (First, Stirling, Scotland, June 25 - July 1, 1978) pp.1-26. (Microfiche ED 158 539).

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Expert Meeting on Special Education." Report presented at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, October 15 - 20, 1979. Final Report. Microfiche:ED 228 758.

Weatherman, Richard. "Impressions from Latin America." Minnesota Severely Handicapped Delivery Systems Project, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education, University of Minnesota, April 7, 1987, p.11.